1		The Honorable Marsha J. Pechman
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE	
10		
11	RIVKA SPIVAK,	CASE NO. C20-1480 MJP
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	PLAINTIFF'S SURREPLY TO
14	ALPHABET INC, et al.,	GOOGLE'S MOTION TO DISMISS
15	Defendants.	
16		
17		
18	Plaintiff files this surreply to Google's Motion to Dismiss (Dkt #31). In Google's reply	
19	(Dkt #46), they make the following statement: "Because there was and is no federal prosecution,	
20	Plaintiff's claim of interference with a federal prosecution fails." (Dkt #46, page 6 line 24). This	
21	is a new allegation not raised in Google's original motion. Google's original motion only	
22	challenged whether Plaintiff has sufficiently alleged a federal prosecution. It did not deny that	
23	one existed.	
24		

To establish that this distinction is material, Plaintiff asks this Court to take judicial 1 notice of United States Department of Justice et al v. Google LLC (1:20-cv-03010 District of 2 Columbia District Court, Filed: 10/20/20). Plaintiff also avers that on September 13, 2019 she 3 gave Google notice that she had sent evidence to the anti-trust investigators. She shared with 4 them the letter she sent to the Attorney General's office. That letter began with "I am writing 5 because of what I know about Google's anti-competitive ad-tech strategies. I first raised 6 concerns about this, internally, as a Google employee, back in 2011 and I continued to raise 7 other concerns regarding the ethics of Google's monopolistic ad-tech approach throughout the 8 remainder of my employment." 9 Google's allegation that "there was and is no federal prosecution" is not true. Google is 10 aware of the anti-trust case brought by the United States Department of Justice. Google is also 11 aware that Plaintiff has previously testified in the investigation that led to that prosecution. 12 Google's allegation that "there was and is no federal prosecution" should be stricken 13 from their reply because it is a new material allegation not raised in their initial motion. 14 15 16 DATED: December 10, 2020 Respectfully Submitted, 17 s/Rivka Spivak (Pro Se) 18 128 NE 51st Street Seattle, WA 98105 19 617.519.1100 rebeccaspivak@outlook.com 20 21 22 23 24